

Serial No.: 10/709,182 (U03-0233.076)

stored in a handheld computer and a host computer, the handheld computer and the host computer each having a plurality of data sets including at least one common data set wherein each computer has a copy of the common data set. In other words, Chase is directed toward maintaining accuracy and continuity between a pair of data sets stored on a handheld computer and a desktop computer (col. 1, lns. 9-12). This is the scenario of a computer user wanting to 'sync up' his PDA database with his personal computer database. Moreover, Chase deals with synchronizing data sets and conflict resolution between data sets.

The present invention has no interest whatsoever in device or data synchronization between sets of data. The present invention does not seek to 'synchronize' data from the mobile phone with data maintained by the information service. In fact, the mobile phone has no access to the data maintained by the information service and vice-versa. There is no exchange of similar data sets in the present invention. The present invention merely makes a request from the information service and utilizes some novel techniques to capture the response to the request.

The Examiner cites col. 3, lns. 26-56 in her rejection of claim 1. Col. 3, lns. 26-56 happen to be the entire "Summary of the Invention" for the Chase patent. The Examiner has failed, however, to apply the cited portion to the specific elements and steps in the claims of the present invention. There is no part of the cited reference that directly or indirectly describes, "placing a call to an information service to obtain a requested phone number", detecting the requested phone number returned from the information service", nor "storing the requested phone number returned from the information service within the mobile phone". Nor has the Examiner attempted to describe equivalents for the aforementioned claim steps. Not once does Chase describe a phone call as the means of communication between the two devices as is claimed in the present invention.

The Examiner has summarily and improperly stated that the Chase summary anticipates claim 1 of the present invention. Applicant has reviewed the Chase patent and can not find a single reference to an information service that provides a phone number based upon a request from a mobile phone. A fair reading of Chase does not, in Applicant's opinion, read on claim 1 or any other claim of the present invention and the Examiner has provided no specific guidance either. The cited summary of Chase is dedicated to describing a synchronization methodology between a handheld computer and a host computer that utilizes strict protocols to manage the data. Any reference to wireless technology is merely in the context of the conduit used to pipe the data between the devices.

In sum, the Examiner has misapplied the Chase patent to the present invention in several ways. Chase and the present invention are solutions to different problems that utilize different methods, infrastructure, and communication means to exchange data between different devices for com-

TRII\619317v1

Page 2 of 3

Serial No.: 10/709,182 (U03-0233.076)

pletely different purposes. Chase describes establishing a link between two computing devices, one handheld, using TCP/IP over a wired or wireless carrier for purposes of synchronizing data sets between the two computing devices. The present invention describes establishing a connection between a mobile phone and an interactive information service where the connection is an actual phone call. During the call a request is made for a phone number. The phone number is found by the information service and returned to the mobile phone where it is detected and stored for current and future use.

The remaining rejections to the claims are more summary applications of unrelated technology that lack any specific references to the claim steps/elements that would allow Applicant to articulate a specific response. In addition, the language of the rejections often do not form sentences that make sense. Phrases have been haphazardly inserted in seemingly random order. The net effect is an incomplete or nonsensical description of the present invention and prior art. Applicant refers the Examiner to the paragraph that starts "*Regarding claim 1*" as an example.

As a result, reconsideration of this application and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a) rejections of claims 1-37 is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner is authorized to charge any fees required and not paid herein, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 Dec 2005

Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory Stephens  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,329  
Moore & Van Allen PLLC  
430 Davis Drive  
Suite 500  
Morrisville, NC 27560-6832

TRJ11619317v1

Page 3 of 3